

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

TRISHKA LAMPKIN, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, et
al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 2:20-cv-1204-JAM-JDP

ORDER

Plaintiffs' motion for entry of default judgment was submitted for decision without oral argument by the magistrate judge on May 21, 2024. The matter was referred to a United States Magistrate Judge pursuant to Local Rule 302(c)(19) and 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

On February 10, 2025, the magistrate judge filed findings and recommendations herein which contained notice to the parties that any objections to the findings and recommendations were to be filed within fourteen days. No objections were filed.

The court presumes that any findings of fact are correct. *See Orand v. United States*, 602 F.2d 207, 208 (9th Cir. 1979). The magistrate judge's conclusions of law are reviewed de novo. *See Robbins v. Carey*, 481 F.3d 1143, 1147 (9th Cir. 2007) ("[D]eterminations of law by the magistrate judge are reviewed de novo by both the district court and [the appellate] court . . ."). Having reviewed the file, the court finds the findings and recommendations to be supported by

1 the record and by the proper analysis.

2 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

- 3 1. The Findings and Recommendations filed February 10, 2025, are **ADOPTED IN**
4 **FULL**;
- 5 2. Plaintiff's motion for default judgment, ECF No. 77, is **DENIED**;
- 6 3. The court **DECLINEs** to exercise supplemental jurisdiction over plaintiff's state law
7 claim against defendant Matthew Cortez;
- 8 4. Plaintiff's state law claim against defendant Matthew Cortez is **DISMISSED without**
9 **prejudice** to refiling in state court; and
- 10 5. The Clerk of Court is **DIRECTED** to **CLOSE** this action.

11 Dated: February 26, 2025

/s/ John A. Mendez

12

THE HONORABLE JOHN A. MENDEZ
13 SENIOR UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28